

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of October 30, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1-2, 14 and 17 are amended, and claims 3-4 and 18 are cancelled. The limitations from claims 3 and 4 are incorporated into claim 1, and the limitations from claim 18 are incorporated into claim 18. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 14 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Osano (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,591) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,217). As mentioned above, independent claim 1 is amended to include the limitations from claims 3 and 4, and now recites that transmitted frequencies of the band-pass filter component are within a radio frequency range, and suppressed frequencies comprise mobile phone frequencies and audio frequencies. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose or suggest this limitation of amended claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, Suzuki states that the bandpass filter (33) (BPF) allows frequency components within a speech band, i.e. 300 Hz-3 kHz to pass there through, while rejecting frequency components outside of the band. See Suzuki column 3, lines 18-20. In addition, Suzuki states that the low pass filter (LPF) (46) allows the frequency components with a speech band to pass there through without causing a substantial loss, and a high frequency carrier components of 800 MHz band to bypass to a ground level. See Suzuki column 3, lines 60-63. However, claim 1 recites the opposite of the teachings of Suzuki. The band pass filter recited in claim 1 transmits frequencies within a radio frequency range, and suppresses frequencies in the mobile phone and audio frequency ranges. It is commonly understood that radio frequency ranges include 3MHz-30 MHz for shortwave, 535 kHz-1.7 MHz for amplitude modulation (AM), and 88 MHz-108 MHz for frequency modulation (FM). Therefore, the frequency components within the speech band discussed in Suzuki, i.e. 300 Hz to 3 kHz are not within the radio frequency range. In fact, Suzuki specifically refers to the speech band, and claim 1

specifically states that the audio frequency range, i.e. 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz, is suppressed. Therefore, Suzuki at most discloses the opposite of the limitations recited in claim 1, because in Suzuki frequency components within the speech band are allowed to pass. Osano fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Suzuki, and therefore for at least the reasons discussed above claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claim 18 is amended to contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The dependent claims rejected above, and not cancelled, are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies. The rejection of claims 3-4 and 18 is moot in view of the cancellation of those claims.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 28 March 2004



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955